THE GARDNER A. SAGE
LIBRARY
NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J.

# FELLOWSHIP

October 1944 Vol. X—No. 10

## Can Conscription Be Justified?

By OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

## Birthday of a Nation

By E. STANLEY JONES

## Vindicae Flammae

By GERALD HEARD

## Acid Test of Church Administered CPS Camps

By FRANKLIN KELLEY

•

## The Election, the War, and the Peace

By A. J. MUSTE

A Gandhi, naked, starved, in prison,
Knowing not fear nor hate, is free.
His gaolers, cramped in armor-plate,
Shriveled of soul by fear and hate—
Can they know liberty?

—Mary Eva Kitchell

15 cents a copy $1.50 a year

# John Haynes Holmes

GANDHI, in his seventy-fifth year (October 2nd), looms high upon the horizon of the world. His is a sublime and august figure. What he means to India can be known only to Indians. What he means to mankind can be known only to posterity. What he means to pacifists and the pacifist movement is already plain.

I

Gandhi has contributed to pacifism two original and momentous achievements in the realm of human affairs:

In the first place, he has interpreted and organized pacifism as a mass movement for action on a universal scale. Before his time, pacifism was a discipline of personal life. Thus, Jesus hardly carried his ideas of "resist not evil" and "love your enemies" beyond a commandment for the individual. If one was struck upon the right cheek, he was to turn the left; if one was robbed of his coat, he was to give his cloak also; if one was forced to go a mile, he was to offer to go twain. The enemy, to be sure, was no mere personal enemy. This enemy was the Roman who enslaved the land—every Jew who heard Jesus speak knew that! But Jesus's word was that the disciples should refuse to follow the example of the Zealots in resisting this enemy, but on the contrary, in their personal relations, should seek to do them good and not evil.

When Jesus's gospel moved at all beyond the range of personal discipline in this field of pacifism, it was to become the beating heart of groups of spiritual non-conformists. Such a group of non-resistants were the early Christians. All through the Middle Ages there were heretical sects which pledged themselves to the rule of love. In our own time, stemming from the Reformation, we have the Friends, the Mennonites, the United Brethren. In the nineteenth century appeared Tolstoi and the Tolstoians, and in the Moslem world Baha O'llah and the Bahaists. But such groups have always been small in size, separatist in nature, and therefore quite apart from the main body of mankind.

Now comes Gandhi to make pacifism a mass movement—the upsurge of a whole society, the awakening of a whole nation! Nothing is more conspicuous in Gandhi's work than the fact that his discipline of the spirit he took not to a small group of personal followers merely, but to the great body of his fellow countrymen. What was a rule of conduct for the individual was made the regimen of action for an entire people. A whole society was in revolt without fighting! How Gandhi achieved this extension of the pacifist principle from retail to wholesale, if I may so express it, offers one of the most fascinating studies of history. We do not yet begin to comprehend the significance of what he has done. But this we know—that in our time has begun a new era in human affairs.

II

Gandhi's second achievement in the pacifist field is analogous to the first. He has made pacifism a really effective weapon of resistance against evil. The reproach directed against pacifism has always been that, in its refusal to fight, it was indirectly aiding the enemy. Willing to endure the onslaught of violence, it was really ensuring the victory of this violence. It is not enough to abhor iniquity and ignore oppression, so the argument ran. We must take up arms against these evils "and by opposing, end them." Reluctance in ourselves to kill and destroy, and therewith stain our souls with guilt, is no excuse for evading or avoiding this responsibility. The first duty of a man is to protect his own—his home, his country, his liberty and life. To the Quaker pioneer who said that he would not shoot to save his wife from the redskins, it was a convincing retort that while he might be a good Quaker, he was a bad husband!

The answer of the pacifist to such arguments has always been an appeal to the laws of the spirit—that "love never faileth" to end hate, disarm violence, and overcome evil. An answer which seldom brings conviction to the practical-minded man! But now comes Gandhi with a technique of resistance against force and violence, conquest and oppression, which is non-violent! It is not necessary, says this great Indian, to shoot and kill in order to turn back the invader. It is sheer spiritual incompetency, the human succumbing to the brute within us, to feel that in every emergency we must take up arms. All we have to do is to mobilize and organize ourselves as systematically without arms as the militarists mobilize and organize themselves with arms, and be as well disciplined and brave and resolute, and we can then protect ourselves from any evil that any enemy may bring against us—achieve any good end of liberation that we may be seeking. Pacifism, in other words, is no light and easy thing, no mere improvisation, least of all a stark policy of inaction. Pacifism is a method of resistance—even of attack! But it must have a science of operation as precise and rigorous as military science. Gandhi has given us this science. Any one who has read Shridharani's *War Without Violence* is familiar with this pacifist manual of arms.

III

This is a part at least of Gandhi's service to the pacifist cause. He has universalized our ideal, and made it practically effective. War henceforth is unnecessary, and therefore inexcusable. The Mahatma has shown to us the way of life, for nations as well as for men. We have now but to learn to walk therein to save our world from death.

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, A. J. MUSTE *Editors*
J. ELLIOTT FINLAY *Managing Editor*

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS
Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Vera Brittain
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Eugene Exman
Caleb Foote
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Helene Hale
John Haynes Holmes
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Elmore M. McKee
Ferner Nuhn
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Edwin McNeill Poteat
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly. Reentered as second class matter February 15, 1941, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

15 Cents a Copy $1.50 a Year

## Conference Schedule

FOR Regional Conferences scheduled for the coming month are: Nashville, Tennessee, Oct. 6-8; Denver, Colorado, Oct. 6-8; Seattle, Washington, Oct. 13-15; San Francisco, California, Oct. 20-22; Los Angeles, California, Oct. 27-29. Information concerning programs may be secured by writing to any of the various regional FOR offices listed on page 179 of this issue of FELLOWSHIP.

# FELLOWSHIP

*THE JOURNAL OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION*

**October 1944** **Vol. X—No. 10**


# Can Peacetime Conscription Be Justified?

By OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

THERE are two vitally important questions the advocates of peacetime conscription should be forced to face in addition to those which relate directly to peace and a warless world. They are: (1) Can conscription be justified militarily? and (2) What guarantees do they give that this departure from American tradition and democracy will not have a most deleterious influence upon our republican institutions? I leave aside the question of the effect of conscription upon the individual, and whether the involuntary drafting of young Americans comports with that honored promise that they shall have the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." I want instead to see if the advocates of conscription will forget for once their assertion that the young American "owes" this to the country and that he will be enormously benefited by a year of discipline, military training, subordination of his will to others and by his physical development under army instruction, and meet these two questions I have just stated.

Can it be justified militarily? Well, the average man will say that General Marshall has asked for it—for a small standing army and universal peacetime training—and may entrench himself upon that. To this the answer is that General Marshall's statement means absolutely nothing until it is explained and clarified. What does he mean when he speaks of a small regular army? In 1898, when we took our plunge into global imperialism we had an army of 25,000 men. A few years ago the army was more than 160,000. Today there are 11,000,000 men under arms. Just where in this list is General Marshall going to place his small army? Does he mean small compared to the figure of 160,000, or has he in mind a small army in comparison with the present 11,000,000? Contrasted with the latter his small army might be 500,000 or a million or even two millions. Again, what figure has he in mind for the annual levy upon our young manhood? It is generally agreed that about 1,250,000 young men reach conscription age each year. How many of these does General Marshall expect to have in hand for the annual training? If 250,000 of them are found to be ineligible because of mental or physical defects, and if the navy receives 300,000 of the remaining million, we shall have an army of 700,000 conscripts, by no means an inconsiderable force.

Upon the number of conscripts to be trained depends very largely the size of General Marshall's small army if we brush aside for the moment the question of how many regulars will be required to garrison bases and flying fields all over the world, which so many people, and apparently Mr. Roosevelt, wish us to retain when the war is over. To train a conscript force of 700,000 will require thousands of officers—at least 30,000—and large numbers of non-commissioned officers, technicians, medical men, and instructors of every kind. To maintain a million men in camps will require a far larger plant than we ever dreamed of until we got into this war. And that plant will have to be kept up by a permanent force of caretakers, repairers, and artisans of every type and description. The conscripts cannot render this service because they must give all their time to training—it is even very doubtful whether the army can give all the training it would like to and turn out finished 1945 blitzkrieg soldiers in twelve months' time, especially if President Roosevelt's latest suggestion that the men be also taught bookkeeping or some trade is adopted.

There are now so many kinds of soldiers that the layman cannot keep up with the developments. Indeed, in thinking of conscription most people's minds go back to the pre-war militia of close-order-drill days or even the regular army of 1940. Today an army is a mass of specialists, parachutists, tank mechanics and drivers, amphibian troops, chemical warfare men, motor truck specialists, radio men without end, communications soldiers in the Signal Corps, aviators of all categories, engineers also of every variety and description. It would be a worthwhile bet that before long the one year's service will demonstrably have failed to produce the reserves which General Marshall says is one of the purposes of this universal levy. As a matter of fact, I heard Major George Fielding Eliot tell the House Military Affairs Committee that two years of service would be absolutely the minimum in order to train the modern soldier. But supposing that one year will suffice, is it not obvious that General Marshall's small army will have to have a very large number of specialists of every kind to impart all of this so very technical training?

Let us now go back to the other proposed uses of our army, the garrisons to be maintained at outlying American points and in foreign countries. Even after the period of the occupation of the enemy countries has come to an end, if we are really going to girdle the globe with garrisons, as I heard one of the highest members of the Administration say last winter that we were planning to do in order to keep the peace of the world, it is hard to believe that this overseas work can be done by one-year conscripts. That

will surely have to be the labor of men enlisted for at least three years of their own free will. That does not exhaust the need for professional soldiers. It is always stated by those who favor conscription that it will be necessary to make the conscripts liable to military service for twelve years all told, so that they may be drawn in if at any time between their 18th and 30th years the country should again go to war. If we suppose that these so-called "refresher courses" will be given twice during the eleven years of a conscript's life after he has served one year in the ranks it is plain that in some years it may be necessary to call in as many as 1,400,000 annually. At the beginning there will probably be just one class called every year, but that adds 700,000 more men. Thus, each summer there will be in training (a) the regular Army, (b) the yearly conscripts, (c) the class called in for the refresher course. Even that does not total all the men who will be in uniform in one year because we have not so far discussed the question whether the National Guard will be continued if conscription comes—another point upon which General Marshall is silent.

Since the National Guards were originally state troops, entirely independent of the Federal Government, for the purpose of keeping order in emergencies or distress, it is not likely that the states will give up this historic institution. Before the war the National Guard was well over 200,000 men. Without speaking of the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the great naval aviation force, or the Marine Corps Reserves or Naval Reserves, who must also be drilled every now and then, it is quite possible that General Marshall's small army, plus conscription and the reserves of all kinds will compel us to put well over 2,000,000 men on the manoeuvre fields every summer. That certainly cannot be described by General Marshall or anybody else as a small army; yet it will all be part of the military machine which must be created if we are to go through with this vast undertaking. As it is, I have allowed only 400,000 as the number of reserve officers and the regular Army. I cannot believe that General Marshall will ask for less than 300,000 regulars.

For the first time, in this war conscription has been applied to the Navy. In every previous war the Navy got all the volunteers it needed. It is now so enormous that the demand for the continuance of conscription for the Navy will persist. How large the Navy will be when this war is over no one can guess. That depends upon many factors, what kind of President we have, what our foreign policy is, whether there is an international world organization, whether we shall really police the world and establish, for example, an American Singapore on the island of Formosa as is contemplated in Washington today in order to keep permanent control of the Japanese. The late Secretary Knox declared that we should have a six-ocean fleet and, with it and the British fleet, rule the world for one hundred years, together keeping the peace. There will be left over after the war an enormous number of naval craft of every description, many new ones having been devised, and special classes, like the aircraft-carrier, having come into special favor and playing a large role. Our harbors will be kept jammed with surplus boats of every description, transports, cruisers, battleships, submarines, submarine chasers, corvettes, destroyers, landing craft, and fast raiders of all types.

Just to maintain this fleet in what the Navy calls "in ordinary" means a great force of caretakers, mechanics, engineers, and supervisory officers. If Mr. Roosevelt and the Navy have their way, I should look for a force of at least 400,000 men, especially if conscription should come to pass. Here again the number of specialists is legion and the demand that great reserve Marine Corps and Navy forces be maintained may well prove irresistible if we are going in for complete imperialism and naval expansion. It is not too much to assume, therefore, that our total Army and Navy forces on duty every summer may come to 2,400,000 men. Just as Hitler put Germany on its feet in some degree by reintroducing universal service and a great standing army, so the temptation in this country will be, certainly during the interim period, to have at least this number of men withdrawn from industrial life and maintained by the Federal Government to keep them off the dole. As General Hershey has said, it would be as easy to keep them in service as to provide for them through some other government agency.

Now what bearing will all this development have upon our republican institutions? Can we escape the evils of militarism, which have accompanied every such development in every other country that has tried it? The average American never thinks about this, or if he does he is perfectly certain that we are so fine and noble and so unmilitaristic that we can embrace militarism 100% and avoid any taint or any ill effect upon our institutions. He is not afraid of our having a large permanent officer class; he does not care what actuated the Fathers of this Republic constantly to oppose a large standing army.

The fact is that already our Army and Navy show signs of developing an officer caste, particularly among the graduates of West Point and Annapolis. I know of one officer who raised a battalion for service with the Navy who was so convinced of this after years of service that he would not permit a single graduate of Annapolis to be an officer in his organization. I have heard many newly appointed officers complain of their disagreeable experiences with the graduates of that historic school, and I recall how Admiral Simms in the last years of his life demanded that it be done away with and that no attempt to keep up an undergraduate school for training officers be countenanced. It is true that if we maintain a very great navy the number of Annapolis men will be very small; it is down to a very low percentage of the whole today. But Annapolis men control all the higher offices and ranks. Even if that does not prevail in the future, the danger from a huge officer class with its nationalistic training and its unceasing demand for more men and more ships, and more guns and more planes, will inevitably take us far along the road of German militarism.

Finally, after having these questions put to them, the advocates of conscription should be made to tell us how they can possibly defend such huge outlays of men and money, if we are to disarm our present enemies and forever prevent their becoming militaristic again. Are we to bestow the great boon of disarmament and freedom from all military activities upon our foes, and saddle ourselves with these burdens, whether there is a world organization or not? Against whom shall we be arming? There are only two other nations that could possibly make war on us —the Russians and the Chinese. Is there no road to security from attacks by these two countries except by complete militarization?

# The Birthday of a Nation

By E. STANLEY JONES

GANDHI will stand in history as the father of his nation. He will occupy the place in India that Washington occupies in America—the father of his country. Just as Washington and his cause were ridiculed, so Gandhi and his cause of freedom are ridiculed.

Listen to this contemporary criticism of our struggle for freedom: "The Revolution was stirred up by a few crafty men. These conspirators were an infernal, dark-designing group of men, obscure, pettifogging attorneys, bankrupt shopkeepers, outlawed smugglers, wretched banditti, the refuse and dregs of mankind." Washington was "at the head of ragged ranks. Hunger and itch are with him, all the lice of Egypt in his train—Great Captain of the Western Goths and Huns." The soldiers were "half savages from the backwoods. Their patriot camp was filled with priests, tailors, cobblers and sailors, insects that emerge to light, rats that nestle in the lion's den. Their inspiration was treason, hypocrisy, fraud, bundles of lies, calumny, riot, cruelty, malice, persecution and superstition."

If our struggle for freedom was thus depicted by its detractors, is it any wonder that Gandhi in his struggle for freedom should be called by Mr. Churchill "a naked fakir" and that any suggestion of treating him on a basis of equality should be ridiculed?

But as then, so now, the years and the centuries will speak against such contemporary and partisan judgments; and what will they say? I predict they will say this:

1. That Gandhi awakened a whole people to national self-consciousness. Just as in China the unit of allegiance was the family and not the nation, so in India the unit of allegiance was the caste and not the nation. And just as in China there is a transfer of the loyalty from the family to the nation, so in India the transfer is being made from the caste to the nation. The greatest single force in that awakening of a national self-consciousness is Mahatma Gandhi. In celebrating Gandhi's birthday we celebrate the birthday of a nation. For in him a nation came to birth.

2. But in Gandhi a nation came not merely to birth—it came to fearless maturity. Gandhi taught the people by precept and by example to stand upright, unafraid. He taught them to stand up and have their skulls cracked without violent resistance, to go to jail without a quiver or a regret, to go back again to jail when released and to spend years there with an unbent will to freedom. Gandhi has taught a traditionally timid people to shed its fears and to demonstrate one of the most amazing upsurgings of courage the world has ever seen—calm, deliberate, unemotional courage.

3. Gandhi has discovered, or rediscovered, a technique by which a nation, dispossessed, can gain its ends without resort to violence. His method is not non-resistance, but an active resistance from a higher level. He taught his people to match a capacity to suffer against the other's capacity to inflict suffering—they would match soul-force against physical force. They would not hate, and yet they would not obey. They would not let their rulers rule them, for they would withhold obedience and take the consequences. The jails were filled and soon became ridiculous. You were a nobody in India if you hadn't been to jail! Your service to your country was counted by the years you had spent in jail. Thus the weapons of the rulers were quietly struck out of their hands. Instead of jails being a punishment they became an honor—those who went in and came out were national heroes. The method of violence thus exhausts itself and defeats its own purpose. Said a sweating Irish police official: "If they would only use the weapons we understand we would show them a thing or two." But Gandhi and his followers were using weapons the West had forgotten. So they seemed strange.

The early Christians knew this weapon—they matched their capacity to suffer against the power of the Roman Empire to inflict suffering. They conquered the Roman Empire by the weapons of non-violence. Jesus knew this weapon. They struck him on the cheek and he struck them on the heart. "Why didn't Jesus strike back when struck on the cheek, didn't he have a legal right to do so?" asked a Hindu of me and I replied, "Yes, according to the law of tit for tat, an eye for an eye, he had a right to strike back, but if he had done so I wouldn't be talking about him today. He turned the other cheek and the blow fell—where? On your heart and mine! He conquers us by his very capacity to suffer non-violently. That is power. The only power."

But we Christians had forgotten this power. We became enamoured of military force, depended on it, and lost our own. Then God took a little Hindu and through him taught us again the power of the cross in collective life. We are not yet ready to take that way. We will have to run into more roads with dead ends, will have to have more military victories which turn to ashes in our hands at the very moment of our greatest triumph, we will have to suffer more frustrations, perhaps, until we are willing to take that way. Some day we will take it. And when we do we will make more progress in a decade than we now make in a warring century.

I write this at the very moment when the Allies are sweeping by victorious might across the borders of Germany. It is the moment of the greatest triumph of military power in history. I would make this prophecy: All of this is a vast illusion. All of it will turn to ashes in their hands, unless they reverse this process and substitute constructive good will to enemies in place of hate, and redemptive reconstruction in place of pulverizing power.

Gandhi has shown us the way. Under disability and wrong we need not knuckle under and submit, nor do we need to go to war. There is an alternative: a mass refusal to obey, with a capacity to take the consequences. That is the power of the future.

But didn't it fail in India? To the degree that violence crept into the movement it did fail. For you cannot use the two weapons, both violence and non-violence. They cancel each other out. Had not violence crept into the movement, India would have gained her freedom be-

(*Please turn to Page* 175)

A modern author presents a miracle story of the Inquisition in thirteenth-century Provence

# Vindicae Flammae

By GERALD HEARD*

"YOU are a Catharist," said the Inquisitor. "I aim at perfection," the prisoner answered. He answered as though desirous of helping an enquirer. His two guards had pushed him forward roughly; they feared him as men fear a plague-carrier. They had, however, held on to him fiercely until that moment, hanging on to him as dogs to a boar that is being pulled down. So they had gripped him from the moment they had hauled him out of the bottle-like dungeon into which he had been dropped when brought into the small town. Now they shoved him away. But not only did he come forward as though of his own will, his wrists were unreddened and his long gown fell undisturbed to his feet.

"He is an Anti-Christ," cried the Dominican, looking across to the old Bishop.

The Bishop's stool had been set in the new paved space outside the Church. The Church front itself was new. The whole town square had, indeed, just been rebuilt. "Clean as cauterized flesh," had said the monk, as he looked round, "a fittingly purged area for pure faith to grow. The very seeds of heresy are sterilized, calcined."

"He said they should both grow till His judgment," the Bishop whispered to himself. He thought of his flock torn in half, one half set to devour the other. He had loved human souls, for in them, surely, was the love of God. But he had seen lovers of God and His dear Son hunt down women and young boys who surely couldn't know the rights and wrongs of what they held, but surely could suffer and, in God's merciful name, had been made to suffer. Then came the war, the frightful climax of the struggle.

He had returned, an old man brokenhearted, to oversee a new town built on calcined human bones, a shepherd of sheep, half of whom he must never even know whether they were dead or living, must never even murmur their names before the Throne of Grace at the Giving of Thanks for the blessed sacrifice which had forgiven mankind. He tried to forget, and when people came to him saying, "One of *them* is in the district," he would reply, "Pray that evil may depart from all of us, from all men, pray." And he would fall on his knees until the informer left him, until the bell rang telling him to begin again *coram populo* his task of open intercession, counsel and sacrifice.

But the "Hound of God," the Domini canis, had come into the district scenting blood. Could the Lamb have a pack of hounds? He must obey; what was he but a simple Bishop, absolutely servile by Holy Obedience before the Servant of the Servants of God, the Bishop of Bishops. Had not the Pope ordered this crusade, this investigation, this inquisition? And this lean devoted man, who was now calling to him across the little square, he had not been in the small town a week before his red worried eye had picked a trail. Here now was his quarry. The hound was baying the morte of the poor creature it had cornered. . . .

He had had to see them die. Some died mute, just fell down in the flames seeming to melt in their fury like pathetic wax: others, in a kind of terrible defiance, summoned all their strength and under the whipping torture of the fire seemed to tear their souls out of their writhing flesh: and others, Oh poor children, just wept and howled and screamed, flinging the awful faggots from their bodies until they could no more, and their cries shrivelled to moans lost in the crackle of the bonfire.

He had ordered that he would never have a fire again in his room. The people thought it was mortification, and it stood him in good stead. But it was that always in the cheerful noise he heard suffocating moans, through the warming blaze he saw look out at him those terrible eyes—of his flock, his children. The pictures of past trials had flashed across his memory. He roused himself. He must confront the prisoner now placed well forward. As long as he was part of the crowd which surrounded him, the Bishop need not face the victim's eyes. Now he must look into those eyes, so soon—.

The Bishop looked up. But already he was being regarded. The face which looked at him was not merely without fear—it was without sorrow or concern. He was aware that someone was regarding him with complete sympathy and interest. With a relief too profound for him to be troubled with seeking for its reason, he turned to the Inquisitor. The monk had already called back the prisoner's attention.

"Your people have striven to destroy the Catholic Church and its Faith."

"I cannot answer for a people. I am here to answer for myself. Together with the Catholic Church, I have striven for the life of union with God."

"Heresy! You will not follow the Church but be an equal."

"I believe that many doctors of the Church have taught what I would practise."

"It is heresy to interpret the Church to herself. The witnesses are ready against you."

"I do not deny that I have had many friends among those who strove after perfection, who were of true sanctity, and who have been—released."

"Bishop, what need have we of further witnesses? He has condemned himself. He has called heretics holy."

The Bishop looked at the two men, he who was deserted and doomed, and he who had life in him and was using it as a power to inflict death." "Son, our Holy Father has given you authority to—cut off from the Church those whom you convict." He looked round at the crowd. He saw the faces blank with a dull expectancy. They were waiting the close of an act to which they were now well

*English author, now head of Trabuco College, Trabuco, California.

accustomed. "Father forgive us, we know not what we do," he said to himself.

The Dominican went through the form of words needed to make cruelty credal. The Bishop watched him: here was a man, given up to doing his duty, performing a function. He recalled when, as a young man, he had gone hawking, coming on his kestrel when it had brought down a pigeon. The raptor looked up at him from its kill with its keen golden eye, then, with a fierce but un-angry efficiency, began to tear the still trembling flesh off its victim's body. In the level sunlight the Inquisitor's eye seemed as keen and as unperceiving as the hawk's. The Bishop turned his own to the condemned man, for he was already condemned, so little time does fearful suspicion take to create irrevocable certainty. But the speed of his doom had neither stunned nor surprised him. He was regarding the crowd with the quiet interest the Bishop had once seen on the face of a great physician from Montpelier who was observing a flock of infected villagers whom the local leeches forbade him to treat. There was in his look a compassion that was completely without heartbreak or any emotional distress. He knew they were diseased; he would do anything he was permitted, to remedy their condition. Meanwhile he had faced the causes of human suffering, so that he could wait.

At that word suffering, the Bishop realized what was now to come with such an intensity that the condemned man turned as though drawn by a cry. The Bishop rose. His chaplain fell in behind him. The deacon followed. The guards laid hold again of the creature they shunned and loathed. The Inquisitor walked beside the Bishop.

"The execution?" he asked. "Until the severed limb is consumed there is danger of the contagion spreading."

"He is confined: Tomorrow is the Feast of the Epiphany. Until this thanksgiving to our Father and His Son for the compassion of the Godhead to us poor darkened sinners be over, until the evening at least, that other act of faith may wait."

"Zeal is a blessed offering to God," the monk declared. The Bishop replied nothing. They entered the small, gaunt palace together. "I have an office to say," the monk excused himself.

In his own apartment the Bishop signed to his chaplain to stay. He sat looking at the empty hearth. His lips were moving. He was saying the office for the dying. Then, "My faithful son, I have been your confessor. I know your heart as mine, and I know it is, as mine, crucified with our dear Lord for this poor rent people of ours. See, say it is my order, that the executioner build up ample fuel. The authorities may order burning; they can exact no more. Now go and leave me."

The door closed and the old man walked to his oratory. He knelt on the stone. The crucifix stood above him. Hour by hour in the gloom his eyes remained fixed on it. As the moon rose its light fell on the face of the Crucified. Without wonder he saw it was the condemned man's; without wonder he saw outline themselves in the gloom on either side of the cross two other crosses. On one hung himself, on the other the Dominican. All night he pleaded, "Lay it not to our charge: remember us when Thou comest into Thy kingdom."

He was aroused by his chaplain who had been kneeling by him, intoning Amen and rising to help his master to rise. The day passed.

"My father," spoke the chaplain to him three times through the long hours, "believe that the Divine Mercy has answered your prayer."

The hour was come, "the hour of the evening sacrifice." The lean crowd was gathered again. His stool was set. The Dominican had mounted his pulpit at the other side and began his sermon. The crowd was opening at the square's other end. The guards entered with the victim. At the upper end stood the stake. Yes, his order had been well served. Like an oblation from the woods, the branches and boughs nearly hid the black post and its chains. The inquisitor paused to give his audience a moment to see the point of his remarks.

And at that moment the prisoner's voice filled the whole place. With a compelling shock of praise it broke out over the stillness. "Sursum Corda." The great Gloria rose with exultation. The monk looked across at the Bishop; the Bishop raised his hands, joining in the holy words. The chaplain, reading his thought, crossed quickly in front of the procession. "The Bishop rejoices in the condemned one's contrition. He cannot order a penitent who is reciting the office to be silent."

The figures moved on. The guards handed the prisoner to the executioners. He mounted the pyre. They secured him among the branches. He thanked them and touched the sprays caressingly. They left him mounted above them alone. The voice of praise rang out like a summons to the celebration of triumph. The torches dipped to the fringes of pine-needles and resinous shrubs. A fragrant scent of wild incense swept the court, the smoke swirled like an autumn mist, the flames ran bright as sunbeams, up the sprays and branches. Like a rising tempest of applause the conflagration roared up and around the raised figure in the midst, but always the great voice in a paean of adoration rose above the tempest.

Then from the Bishop's side two figures moved out and forward. The chaplain and the deacon ran toward the pillar of flame which now rose with a single drive. Their voices joined that of the chanter within the fierce glory. Reaching the hill of fire they ran up it, lightly, the flames plaiting under their feet. He who was in the midst had had his hands raised in triumphant worship, but as they rose to his side he drew each of them to him. Together the three stood in the heart of the splendour.

The Inquisitor and the Bishop had followed. They now stood striving to pierce through the veil of fire which swept up before them. The flame rose too fast and clear to be smoke-capped, a flood of light which shook itself free, a tongue of glory which spoke to the blue overarching quietness of the sky, and was gone. The steadfast blue seemed to tremble as though an invisible curtain had opened and closed before its mystery could be guessed.

"My father, my father," cried the Bishop, "the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof." Their eyes, drawn up, now with the sunk flame sank down. Nothing but a quiet bed of incandescent charcoal remained, lighting with its glow the dusk of the square. On his knees, bent to the hot earth, the monk was repeating, "O ye Fire and Flame, Bless ye the Lord, Praise Him and Magnify Him for Ever." The Bishop, his arms held high, cried with the gratitude of answered prayer, "Oh, Ananias, Azarias and Misael, Bless ye the Lord, and Magnify Him for Ever."

**A CO who knows both types of CPS camps throws out a challenge and proposes an ——**

# Acid Test of Church Administered CPS Camps

By FRANKLIN KELLEY*

ANYONE expressing a personal viewpoint on church-administered CPS camps should realize two dangers into which he might easily fall. First, he might fail to make himself understood because of the wide variety of readers. Secondly, what he says might take the tone of "I'm right and you're wrong." I shall do my best to overcome the first pitfall. And in order to assure the reader of my appreciation of the second danger, I shall begin by saying: All go not the same way. But though there are many paths leading to the summit, to the summit we must climb. Though there are many lines leading to the Center, to that Center we must drive. And I think most of us would agree that climbing toward the summit or driving toward the Center means the development of the human personality, growth into a higher awareness, the integration of ourselves around a true perception of Reality, or the love of Him whom we glibly call God.

Now what has this to do with CPS? I personally believe it has everything to do with it, and with everything else, for that matter. Is it not the first duty of the religious groups that choose to take conscientious objectors under their wing to guide, counsel, inspire, and train these men for the difficult task of "climbing"? And in order to climb, to grow into a higher awareness, is it not essential that they should be made aware of the seriousness of our social and cultural crisis—the mental, physical, and spiritual suffering of the world? Man—COs included—cannot grow "by bread alone." But I fear that, like most contemporary psychiatrists, many of the administrators of religious camps are not sufficiently aware of the *real* soul, the *whole* man, but are primarily concerned with only the animal part of him.

What then are the minimum responsibilities and qualifications of "instructors" of COs, that is, the whole CO? They are almost infinite. I think such instructors must be people who, because of their insight into the *deeper* causes of suffering, their knowledge of the higher destiny of man and the way of contemplative, peaceful living, will give their all—not money or an approving nod of the head, but their whole selves, without any thought of reward. As it is, we are all groping in this business called pacifism. It will be a long time before an adequate metaphysic with complementary virtues will be founded. We have a few scattered leaders but, on the whole, pacifism in our time is frightfully confused. Can adequate guidance and instruction be expected from those who are themselves confused?

In humility the administrators of the religious camps confess that they are not worthy of the task assigned them, but that they are nevertheless trying to give what little they have, hoping that through cooperation with the conscripted men they can see this thing through. This is a noble attitude, but it is not enough. Especially is it not enough when the men, because of a confused mediator, are sheltered from the agency which conscripted them.

None of us relish the thought of the possible ultimate consequences of taking a decided stand on the conviction of conscience as opposed to the wishes of the state. But whether we like it or not, there is a great and growing opposing force, and sometime in the next decade or generation each of us may come into direct contact with the violence of that force. Our pathways must cross, for the way of peace and love must inevitably cross the path of greed and ignorance. Their way contains bullets, and death might be the only choice for those who continue to seek truth. That is cold reality which it would be well for us to contemplate. And the more we think on this, the more we come to realize our shallowness, our inability to live up to the high-sounding words which we utter.

To find peace we must have the love of the Infinite in our deepest heart. To meet the everyday tests resulting from our own ignorance and pride, let alone that ultimate test, we must have inner peace. And that needed peace can only be gained, I believe, through the sternest of training and self-discipline designed with an eye on the real, the true End. If this is so, then it should be asked of the administrators of the religious camps, "Can you impart to these men the needed instruction and training?" It means, not a policy of sheltering, nor one in which the COs are given what they want, but a policy devised to give them what they should have. Any institution should be a means of helping people to come closer to truth. Never should it be a soft cushion against reality. The pathway to truth is not paved with an emphasis on good food, shelter, and protection from the elements.

Can CPS camps administered by the churches be recognized as valid institutions? Instead of immediately answering this question, let us ask what should be contained in an institution designed to uplift these men. First, of course, such an institution must, like a circle, have a center. And that center must be in harmony with eternal virtues and truths, such as love and understanding, natural law and God's will. Those responsible for the administration must somehow be constantly pointing to this center. They must be open to new ideas, but never must they permit false ideas to infringe upon basic principles.

Next, this institution, I believe, must have minimum standards; otherwise it is not an institution. These standards must spring from the center and be designed to keep men turned towards the center. They should be positive means of developing the human personality.

*An FOR member now in CPS Camp No. 52, at Powellsville, Maryland.

And then, as a circumference is obedient to the center, so must the members of an institution be obedient to the principles for which it stands and to those pointing to the center. Unless those who repeatedly fail to live up to, or deliberately infringe upon, these standards can be reasoned into cooperation, they should be asked to leave. For the sake of the individual as well as the group, this act of excommunication, though we dislike the word, must be carried out with love. But essential it is, if an institution is to survive.

Thus we see the necessity of obedience—another word we do not like—obedience of all to the Center, of standards to principles, and of each to his superior. Now, where there are no basic principles to begin with, no men of responsibility pointing to the Center—the love which makes for inner growth—confusion reigns. Where there is no intention of starting from the Center, the circle drawn with a free hand spells utter confusion. Yet, is not this the condition in which the church camps are found?

When the foundation upon which the church camps are built is examined, surely it must be admitted that the original builders failed to take into sufficient consideration that which is more than "bread alone." They failed to recognize that their prime duty is to instruct and train each man who chooses to go along with them. Certainly education along such lines as race relations, post-war relief, and industrial problems is good, but it seems meaningless unless it is preceded by a higher training. It is meaningless as ethics is meaningless without theology, as kindness and courage are meaningless without love and understanding. Now this higher training does not mean fifteen minutes of voluntary silence each morning, a Sunday preaching service, or an occasional visit by a speaker on things spiritual." One cannot learn to swim in six inches of water. In order to be valid the instructions must be of a devout nature, intense and practical, with emphasis on techniques and methods of self-discipline and self-examination which will lift the individual personality and point it towards its higher destiny—the attainment of inward peace. This instruction does not mean a program of "spiritual education" as voiced in our colleges of liberal arts. Rather it means personal instruction from teachers who can teach by means of example, counseling, and love, and who are equipped with a sound knowledge of workable techniques, methods, and disciplines based on the primacy of inward growth.

When the foundation is weak, everything else—policy, standards, administration, education, everything—is weak. One cannot be other than critical of the confused attempts made in every phase of life in these church camps. And if this is the best that can be done within the framework of Selective Service, then I think we must confess that it is not enough to justify the adopting of COs. Is it perfection that is asked for? Certainly not. But it seems to me that one must insist upon a decided trend in the direction as suggested above. If cooperation and obedience is asked of a man, he must insist on certain fundamental principles or else he cannot obey. If he does obey that which is false, then he is being disobedient to that yearning seed within him. Unfortunately our pacifist circles are as yet without enough sensitive teachers equal to this enormous task. Why then should pacifists be so foolish and erect fountains when there is no water?

As for internment in a government camp, one can only say that there the CO is *directly* under the representatives of those who conscripted him. And this, in view of the infancy of pacifism in our time, I believe, is important. In that there is no bargaining agent save the man himself, in that there is no middleman, one can say that the relationship in the government camp is an honest one. The conscriptee is obedient to the extent that he chooses to be obedient to men who think him a coward and who would like to see him in the armed forces. He can choose to love these men and cooperate with them, for they need love; or he can choose to think only of himself and disobey. He might also find cause to refuse cooperation and still manifest love for them. But regardless of how he acts, he is face to face with men who might for various reasons find cause (in their eyes) to punish him and send him off to a more restricted kind of internment. At least he is in contact with a certain element of the opposing force, though for the time being it is satisfied with isolated internment as the proper means of dealing with conscientious objectors.

Now this does not mean that one should purposely seek a situation which highlights the war for its own sake. But one, after being in a government camp, begins to think that the COs under the protective wing of the religious groups would find a greater stimulant to honesty and growth, to the testing of pacifism, in being directly under the thumb, so to say, of "all-out-for-the-war" citizens who will decide in their own emotional way how COs should be treated. That relationship, in view of inadequate instruction elsewhere, seems to me to be far more clear-cut, and surely if the opposing ideology is ever to be met it must be met at arm's length.

We might sum up the question in this manner. If a mother cannot sufficiently instruct her child to the harsh realities of life, she should love the child enough to stand silently by, knowing that the child will grow by burning its fingers. To selfishly clutch the child to her bosom with insufficient guidance is an act unwarranted in the sight of the Most High. And it is my opinion that the church groups, if they cannot offer COs adequate guidance, should let them go to the government, unprotected but encouraged by loving prayers.

All of this does not mean that the administrators are solely responsible for the existing confusion in the church camps. The men, too, have their responsibilities. They, too, must look within and ask themselves how they have failed to cooperate with the leaders in their organization. And if they cannot cooperate with and obey their administrators, are they being fair to their sponsors, to the other campers, and to themselves by tagging along for various reasons of convenience? Can they give full sanction to the policy of their sponsors? And, more than anything else, all of us COs must burrow deep down and in true humility practice self-examination. We too must pledge obedience —obedience to that divine Center, that higher Will. And may we pray that in the face of daily tests we shall not go down as betrayers.

**What kind of peace will be enforced by the proposed world security organization — and how? An analysis of the plans of our politicians and the big powers**

# The Election, the War, and the Peace

By A. J. MUSTE

When this issue of Fellowship reaches our readers the national election campaign will be in full swing. By many thoughtful persons it has been characterized as the most important in our entire history. Yet, unless something now unforeseen happens, there will not emerge any substantial opposition to the administration's course in conducting the war or in planning the peace and the post-war world. There will not even be any large-scale discussion that will make the front pages of the papers or affect the course of policy.

The Republican Party is the one agency that might compel discussion on such a scale. When some weeks ago Senator Bridges made his speech condemning the secrecy surrounding international conferences and the administration's commitments, and urging that our peace aims be defined and published for consideration by other nations, it looked as though the issues were going to be clearly drawn. If the Bridges speech was a trial balloon, the Republican high command must have concluded that the response was adverse to taking such issue. When Mr. Dewey issued his release on the eve of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference expressing apprehension that the peace was shaping up on a power-politics basis, it looked again as though a real debate were in the making. But the outcome of the Dulles-Hull conferences appears to be that on the essential points (which we shall mention presently) Roosevelt and Dewey stand on the same platform.

No substantial opposition or criticism will come from organized labor, or from farm or Negro organizations. Criticism will, therefore, be confined to what comes from church organs, a few secular radical groups, and the pacifists and near-pacifists. That makes it all the more important that each should be aware of the crucial points to watch in determining his own course in the election and in private and public discussion during the campaign. If the picture is somewhat dark, that should not unduly discourage us. Surely pacifists have not expected that the war would produce conditions favorable to peace and general well-being.

## Peace by Force

1. In their discussions of the peace the leaders of the great powers do not emphasize positive measures for restoration of production and orderly living, which would so meet the needs of the peoples that they would wish to maintain this restored world order because of the material and spiritual benefits it would bestow upon all. Rather they emphasize the building of a so-called "security" organization which would be equipped with "force" to keep the peace.

There are a number of things to be said about this approach. For one thing, it is negative. The aim is not to create peace and well-being, but to prevent something—ostensibly war. It is not to bring peoples together to do something they want to do, but to devise a scheme by which, it is hoped, some nations will prevent others from doing something the latter want to do, i.e., go to war.

This approach is inspired by fear and distrust. We must be "secured" against something we fear, namely aggressors. Who are the aggressors? Germany, Japan, and Italy are to be reduced to impotence. No one seriously believes they will start another war soon. What is to be said of the treatment the United Nations propose to mete out to them if it is bound to result in their wanting to go to war again in fifteen or twenty years? Anyway, it is proposed to keep them militarily impotent. Thus it can only be that the victor nations are afraid of their present allies, afraid of one another. On such suspicion and fear no true peace can be built.

The analogy that people use to justify international security by force is that of the police—municipal, state, and federal. But, as the publications of the Pacifist Research Bureau have carefully demonstrated, the use of police against individuals or corporations is entirely different from the use of police, i.e., armies, against nations. Anyone who argued that Canada or Australia could be kept in the British Commonwealth by the guns of the British Navy would be considered out of his head. It is even more absurd to suppose that such force can keep half a hundred nations in a world organization.

It is proposed to keep the peace by force, and yet the force contemplated is not to be truly international. It is to consist of the armed forces of the Big Three. The peace is to be based, in other words, on the most discredited of all means, a military alliance. Each big power under this scheme is to be free in its own sphere of influence. Moreover, according to the current Russian proposal, any one of the Big Three can veto the use of any combined force against any alleged aggressor, one of its cat's-paws in the game of power-politics.

This approach, then, we must expose, combat, and seek to change.

## Balance of Power

2. The so-called peace is to be based on the power-politics pattern. Nations will carry weight according to their economic and military potential. It is easy to guess how much unity we would have in the United States if this were the case with respect to New York and Rhode Island, for example. A gigantic struggle is already under way between the great powers for position in the post-war world under this imperialist pattern. In the inability of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference to come to an agreement, in the open conflict between the Moscow and the London

Polish "governments," in the failure for weeks to supply the people of Warsaw with aid in their struggle against the Germans while the Russian Army was virtually at the gates of Moscow, in the conflict between Nationalists and Communists in China, and at a dozen other points this "war" rages.

## Support of Secret Terms

3. Under such inauspicious circumstances as this, the "security" organization is to be set up, if the administration has its way, before the people know what the terms of peace are. The organization will have as its objective to see that those terms are carried out. If we give the administration its way in this matter, in other words, we may give it in advance a blank check to enforce an evil and disgraceful peace. We pledge support without knowing what we are to support.

Under these conditions, I urge pacifists to oppose any "security" organization based on armed force and any commitment of the United States to support such organizations before the nature of the peace is determined. I take this position in spite of the fact that it may also be the position taken by remnants of isolationists, some economic reactionaries, and others with whom we are in disagreement generally. I do not think we ought to collaborate organizationally with such elements; and, as I have indicated, the Republican party is not offering an alternative. From the pacifist standpoint there is no basis for supporting a "keep-the-peace-by-war" policy. We cannot help it if temporarily, and for reasons entirely different from our own, others take apparently the same position as we do. A few years ago both Bundists and Communists vehemently opposed U. S. entry into the war. Were we therefore to abandon our opposition to that course? No more, it seems to me, can we now engage in fostering any illusion about the nature of the "peace" we are getting.

## Peace by Prolonging War

4. It is natural and under these circumstances inevitable that the idea should be growing that there is to be no attempt at making a peace in the usual sense, but rather are to have in Germany and elsewhere an indefinitely prolonged armistice, the terms of which are to be harsh. We see the pattern in Italy where an armistice, the terms of which are still secret, was signed over a year ago.

The arguments advanced in favor of this idea to dispense with a peace are significant. For example, the problems of a general global peace are too big. That sounds plausible. Actually it means that there is no general principle and no general plan applicable all round. Behind this argument lurk the ambitions of the big powers and the divisions among them.

The last time, it is argued, we "gave" Germany a peace right after the war. Immediately any ambitious politician could bid for power on a "revisionist" platform. This time we just won't give them a peace until at some distant date they have proved themselves "worthy." Again, that is plausible talk. But it ignores or falsifies the reason that "revisionists" could get a hearing in Germany. It ignores the long efforts of the democratic elements in Germany to carry out the peace terms. It implies long-term occupation of Germany and the utterly fallacious assumption that you can develop a democratic and peaceful spirit in a people by putting them in a prison or concentration camp. It is a cover behind which the looting of Germany and the fight over the control of Germany and Europe can take place. It is ironical and tragic to read columnists such as Samuel Grafton saying that the way to end the war is just not to end it. As simple as that! History and God will indeed see to it that on these terms the war does not end, that we get permanent war.

## Permanent War Economy

5. This approach to foreign relations leads to the idea of a permanent military-imperialist regime in the United States and the continuance of the Roosevelt administration as the only one competent to manage so ticklish a situation. Thus we get the emphasis on the role of the Commander-in-Chief. The army is to be increased from some 160,000 before the war to two-and-a-half million. A navy three times as big as all other navies combined is to be kept. Permanent conscription is to be put into effect. Observers in Washington report that hardly a single Senator or Representative can be found who opposes the measure, and that it is certain to be passed after the election or after the New Year unless genuine popular opposition is aroused. The idea expounded by C. E. Wilson, of General Electric, to the Army Ordnance Association some time ago, that we should think in terms of a permanent war economy, fits in with all this.

However great the opposition may be, we must speak out on these matters. During the campaign we ought to discuss them with all candidates for Congress. We owe it to the youth of our nation to present an alternative program. If we do not speak against the present proposals, surely the very stones will cry out.

Even if we achieve no reversal of policy now, we teach pacifism by this constant and patient analysis of events. Pacifism cannot be taught in terms of abstractions and generalities. And the only way in which we may hope to win the masses to abolish war and to try the non-violent way is by constantly keeping our banner aloft. But in order to do this and not to be discouraged by defeats, we shall have to be deeply grounded in the pacifist faith and religiously committed to it in our own lives.

---

## The Birthday of a Nation

(*Continued from Page* 169)

fore this and she would have assumed the moral leadership of the world. But even though violence did creep into the movement there was such a core of reality there that in spite of that violence the essential power remains. And, moreover, India will get her freedom—it is inevitable. For Gandhi represents a cause and Churchill represents a reaction. Churchill belongs to the dying past, while Gandhi, representing the cause of freedom, belongs to the future. Then for the first time in modern history we will see the emergence of a new power for national freedom. A nation has gained its freedom without recourse to violence! That is a landmark in human history.

And I, who have had my differences with Mahatma Gandhi, forget all those differences in the face of this tremendous fact—the achievement of freedom by non-violent methods, and salute him on his birthday.

## News from the Peace Front

# Peacetime Conscription Threatens the Nation

The American Legion has decided to make its major legislative objective for the coming year the enactment of legislation providing for universal compulsory military training after the war. The decision was reached after James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, spoke in favor of such legislation at the Legion's national convention in Chicago on September 20.

The political power of the Legion added to the influence of a score of national committees and other groups working for peacetime conscription now constitute a serious threat to the forces working for a durable peace. There is danger that even many church groups and others sincerely seeking lasting peace may be led into believing that permanent conscription is the only way to achieve their goal.

Selective service officials have expressed themselves as favoring the control of any peacetime conscription system entirely by a joint Army-Navy board, purportedly because such control would "keep the program out of politics." They carefully avoid admitting that such control would also keep the program out of the public eye and would grant a small group of military-minded men almost dictatorial powers.

At almost the same time word came from London that the British Government "has completed plans for compulsory military training for all boys over the age of 14 after the war," requiring them to enter one of the three cadet services at that age and then give a year's service in the regular army, navy, or air force after reaching the age of 18. The plans permit *no exemptions except on medical grounds.* The implication is that the British militarists hope to get all boys indoctrinated with militarism before they are old enough to develop ideas about conscientious objection.

Gen. George C. Marshall, United States Chief of Staff, suggests that peacetime military training for all youths is the only alternative to maintaining a large standing army which, as he admits, is contrary to American democratic traditions. But then he proceeds to suggest a force of 700,000 men for Army and Air Corps; and Navy officials say the Navy can be cut down to about 1,600,000, including Coast Guard and Marines. This total peacetime force of 2,300,000 men would cost, they estimate, approximately six billion dollars a year to maintain!

These are straws that show which way the wind is likely to blow in the post-war world; and it appears unlikely to be anything but an ill wind. Pacifists, however, may find some hope in the fact that a few large and influential bodies have come out in opposition to peacetime conscription, or at least to consideration of the matter during wartime. The statements of some of these groups were printed in the August issue of FELLOWSHIP. You can help in the fight against conscription by writing to your congressmen and to newspaper editors about the views of these groups, and also by distributing FOR leaflets and flyers now available. (See back cover.)

## More Than 3,000 COs in Prison

The Department of Justice reports that 4,363 men claiming to be conscientious objectors have been convicted of violations of the Selective Service Act up to June, 1944, and 500 more were awaiting prosecution. Jehovah's Witnesses made up about 70 per cent of the total. At the time of the report 3,203 of the convicted men were actually in prison, 2,514 of them Jehovah's Witnesses.

The NCCO reports that there has been a considerable increase in the number of paroles granted imprisoned COs during the past year. Regular paroles have been granted to 125 of the 248 COs (other than JWs) whose applications were acted upon; but among Jehovah's Witnesses the score was only 50 paroles out of 233 applications. The figures for parole under the 8641 plan were not announced, though the report said the number of paroles to special service is steadily increasing. However, large numbers of men eligible for such parole have refused to apply.

The NCCO advises that Selective Service genuinely desires to secure 8641 parole for as many men as possible, but that final authority rests with the Department of Justice, which has denied parole to 25 men recommended by Selective Service in the past three months.

## Richmond Conference

An FOR conference will be held in Richmond, Virginia, on Friday afternoon and Saturday, November 3 and 4, according to announcement from Constance Rumbough, Southern Secretary. The conference will be addressed by Dr. Henry J. McGuinn, a professor at Virginia Union University, A. J. Muste, FOR National Co-secretary, and Emily Parker Simon, Director of the Baltimore Peace Center and formerly engaged in Friends refugee work in Spain.

## Conscription Protest

Corbett Bishop, a CO who has spent the past two years or more in various CPS camps, the last two being the government camps at Mancos and Germfask, recently undertook a campaign of complete non-cooperation against conscription. He left Germfask on furlough, came East, and called on the men repsonsible for the administration of CPS camps and the Federal prisons, notifying them of his intentions.

About the middle of September he was arrested and indicted, though he did not appear in court because he refuses to walk. The judge came to the prison to hear what he had to say. After indictment he was taken to Grand Rapids, Michigan, to be held pending trial. It is reported that while in prison he is refusing to eat or work or in any way cooperate with the officials.

Bishop is a Christian pacifist and a disciple of Tolstoy and Thoreau. He is about 38 years old.

## Youths Confused About the War

In spite of the floods of propaganda designed to create and maintain enthusiasm in support of the war efforts of our nation, it appears that more than half of our high school youth are not wholeheartedly committed to the war program.

A study of seven thousand youths in Chicago high schools was reported in the *American Journal of Psychiatry* recently. On the basis of themes written about the war, Mandel Sherman classifies the writers as follows, according to their attitudes toward the war:

| | |
|---|---|
| Directly antagonistic | 5% |
| Critical | 6% |
| Indifferent or neutral | 21% |
| Confused | 12% |
| Mildly favorable, partly critical | 9% |
| Favorable | 26% |
| Strongly favorable | 21% |

The author of the report reveals interesting facts about his own attitude in making the following comments:

"From the standpoint of the state of the world in the midst of war . . . the first four attitudes recorded above must be regarded as unfavorable and grievously unfortunate. . . . Here are youths who would soon have to face the question of military service and who were hostile to American participation in the war or expressed ideas favorable to the enemy, or who were critical of the war effort on the utterly unrealistic premise that 'war is wrong,' or who took no particular stand one

way or the other except to complain of personal deprivations, or who admitted that they did not know what the war was all about or what we are fighting for."

The writer raises questions as to who is responsible for these "grievously unfortunate" conditions, and hints that it may be the schools, the parents, the prevailing community spirit, or the newspapers.

## Eastern Conference

The fall conference for the Eastern region of the FOR was held in Labor Temple, New York City, September 22-24. Addresses were given by A. J. Muste, Harry Paxton Howard, author of *America's Role in Asia,* John Nevin Sayre, and Tracy Strong, General Secretary of the World Committee of the Y. M. C. A. Douglas Steere, of Haverford College, delivered the closing sermon.

An unusual feature of the conference was a series of action projects in which delegates participated on Saturday afternoon, including a "poster walk" up Broadway carrying signs calling for the freeing of Puerto Rico from United States imperialism, a public opinion poll on post-war conscription, disarmament, occupation of Germany, and world government.

The National Council of FOR met in sessions before and after the conference. Among other things they decided to undertake a program of action to get organizations that have declared their opposition to the adoption of peacetime conscription during the war to work actively against the campaign to push the matter through Congress after election.

## India vs. Wavell

It is heartening to see that the press of all opinions in India rallied to Gandhi's side in a protest against Viceroy Wavell's "intransigence." The *Khilafat,* a Moslem organ, said: "The Viceroy's refusal to meet Mr. Gandhi is not only astonishing, deplorable and unstatesmanlike, but is also against common courtesy and propriety." The *Leader,* a liberal paper from Allahabad asserted, "What Britain has in store for India is something not even faintly resembling independence, but some sort of semi-totalitarian constitution which will be decorated with democratic phraseology, but the chief object of which will be to make India safe for British interests and British finance." Yet, the publication *India Today* goes on to say, Gandhi continues his admirable fight to solve the deadlock in the situation and so assure the full support of India in the Allied effort to defeat Japan, but the British remain obdurate, and seem to be doing everything in their power to insure the failure of his efforts.

## Our "Little India"

During the past year many liberals have become concerned about our treatment of Puerto Rico, which the United States took over in 1898 with the promise of eliminating the evils of Spanish rule. Governor Tugwell now admits that conditions are no better than when we took over the island. It has been pointed out that the record of our rule there is blacker than that of Britain in India, and that the bill now before Congress would offer Puerto Rico less than Churchill offers India. And all of Latin America resents our imperialistic treatment of this helpless nation. Poverty, unemployment, overcrowded slums, filth, and disease are a disgrace to United States administration there. Write your Congressmen and urge remedial action at once.

## Senate Discriminates

The United Council of Church Women has sent an appeal to President Roosevelt to abolish the existing race segregation in the Senate cafeterias. They say: "If you are to save our nation from civil war more horrible than the horrors that now engulf us, you cannot permit the conditions that give rise to such an incident to exist in our national buildings and in our national capitol." She declared that a group of women including a Negro was denied service at both the Senate cafeterias when the group appeared at the Capitol to testify before a subcommittee on the establishment of a permanent FEPC.

## Good Germans?

In a remarkably brave statement of some 3,000 words, the Confessional Church of Germany issued a call to repentance to violators of the fifth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill." The message attacked the policy of liquidation of racial groups, and further declared that the state is empowered to use the sword only in execution of criminals and in defense of the nation from enemies during war.

"We have often remained silent, have said too little, or have been too timid to stand up to our conviction that God's commandments apply to us and to our time. We have not given heed to God's warnings. . . . Woe to us and our nation when we make little of the life that God has given, and man, whom God created in His image, is only assessed as to his utility; when it is considered right to take life because human beings are considered as of no value, or because they belong to another race; when hatred and cruelty are the order of the day. For God says: "Thou shalt not kill!"

The church goes on to urge all Christians to aid all needy persons regardless of race, creed, or nationality—the Jew and the Christian alike.

# Jottings

At its second national convocation in College Camp, Wisconsin, the Methodist Youth Fellowship passed a resolution declaring: "We insist that the agencies of the Church shall not be used in preparation for war, but in the promulgation of peace; we insist that the buildings of the Church dedicated to the worship of God shall be used for that holy purpose, and not by any agency for the promotion of war."

* * *

Twelve million francs were spent by the Secours Quakers during 1943 in carrying on the child feeding program operated by the American Friends Service Committee in France. The French organization's activities covered seven cities including Paris Toulouse, Lyon and Marseilles.

* * *

The Forerunners can now boast of forty groups of teen-age youth across the country. They are led in most cases by college-age members of the FOR, and meet in groups to undertake interracial programs and the study of the many problems which beset us today.

* * *

In order to teach illiterate soldiers to read and write, thousands of elementary English lesson books were ordered from a certain large correspondence school and shipped directly to army posts. The Army Education Office in Washington later received a call from a distant post asking whether they had read the book. No, it hadn't. "Well," said an angry voice over the phone, "you should have. The first line reads, 'Under no circumstances is war justifiable.'" The book, we understand, has since been withdrawn.

* * *

The Brethren Service Committee has the intention of sending heifers to Europe and Asia after the war, even to Germany and Japan. More than 1,000 heifers are now being raised by Brethren farmers in the Northern States for that express purpose, and there is the hope that some may be shipped to France and Spain by late fall. Last month 22 heifers were sent to Puerto Rico to help relieve a serious milk shortage.

* * *

The Maryknoll Fathers have begun what has been called the most advanced social service program in South America in Talca, Chile. Night school classes are held not only in the basic elements of education, but also in ethics, rights of labor, health problems, and cultural subjects. Only workers are permitted to study at the school, and afternoon classes are conducted for wives of workers. Playgrounds and clinical care are planned for the near future.

# The Peacemaker's Bookshelf

## American Imperialism

*America's Role in Asia,* by Harry Paxton Howard. Howell, Soskin, Publishers, Inc., N. Y. C. 1943. $3.00.

America's role in Asia, as portrayed by Harry P. Howard, has not been a glorious one, unless one considers imperialism a glorious thing. Whether in relations with Korea, as far back as the 1890's; whether in China, as, for example, when "it was the American Government, in a resolution prepared by Secretary Hughes himself, which brought forth a formula which *for the first time* openly approved the maintenance of foreign troops in China without treaty rights"; or lastly, whether it was Secretary Stimson's note to Japan (November 5, 1931, six weeks after the invasion of Manchuria), in which he assured the Japanese of our warm sympathy in their "attempt to secure respect" for their "treaty rights in Manchuria" — most of our relations with Asia have been marked by military, political, or financial intervention on behalf of American privilege. Of particular interest is the author's statement that "As shown clearly by the Lytton Commission's report, participated in and endorsed by the United States, our aim was joint foreign domination of Manchuria instead of exclusively Japanese domination."

After fifty pages of introduction, showing realistically the upheaval in Asia, the author traces the development of Japan from a colony to an empire. As one reads on through these hundred pages, sub-consciously one begins to think "This man is biased against Japan," which might not be surprising, in view of the fact that he was deported from Japan in 1922. However, as one reads on still further through the next two hundred pages, tracing the devolution of China from an empire back to the status of a colony and as one reads the author's reflections on the connivings of Russia (later the USSR), Great Britain, Japan, France, Germany, and the United States, sometimes separately and sometimes in groups, it is clear that the author is objective in his thinking, fearless in his denunciation of exploitation wherever found, and a staunch friend of democracy, people's rights, and representative self-government wherever found. His flaming indignation is superb. His irony is subtle. The final pages are devoted to "Asia and the Future" and contain the writer's interpretation of the events he has outlined.

The book is a compilation of a mass of relevant historical data, though a few errors mar the otherwise authoritative nature of this important work. One may question, for instance, how the very words of the Emperor Meiji, spoken in 1910, could have been accurately reported; the obvious exaggeration of the statements that "The Emperor is wholly the creature of the militarists and their reactionary associates" and "The pretended code of Bushido was invented just forty years ago"; and, perhaps the most unwarranted statement of all that there were "wholesale butchery" and "official massacres" attending the 1923 earthquake, with "three thousand of his helpless subjects" burning to death, outside the gates of the Imperial Palace "within sight of the idiot Emperor Taisho." These and others are distressing to the informed reader. However, the main thesis of the book stands in spite of them.

Readers may differ as to what this thesis is, but it seems that it is stated in the early pages of the book: "This past hundred years has seen China brought down deeper and deeper to subjection to outside powers, while Japan has become the great power of the Far East. *The reason for this amazing reversal of roles lies neither in China nor in Japan. It lies in the activities, influences, and pressures of Western Powers in the Far East."*

There is a disconcerting use of the Japanese word "bushi" throughout. That word is rarely used in conversation in Japan today, unless reference is made to the "samurai," freely translated into English as "the ancient warrior." The use of "bushi" to describe the totality of reactionary forces in Japan is not clarifying.

Coercion of states seems to be a possibility, in the opinion of the author, when he writes that League sanctions against Japan, if applied, "could not possibly have been resisted." On the other hand, while writing of Secretary Hull's significant radio address of July 23, 1943, referring to the "exercise of surveillance over aggressor nations," Howard remarks "This surveillance over Germany, Japan, Italy, and their satellites will mean still more serious problems for the post-war world."

The chapters on "The Chinese Republic" and "Free China" show intimate knowledge of the life of the people—the common people—of that stricken land. Nor is the situation hopeless. In rural life, "it is the village democracy of China which furnishes such a real and sure basis for democratic government in China" and in urban life "it was the self-reliance and practical experience of the guildsmen in the cities . . . which made the revolution for representative government so hopeful."

The author draws many valid conclusions that should be noted. Space permits mention of but two: (1) "The Russo-Japanese Non-Aggression Pact (April, 1941) corresponds to the main strategic interests of both powers . . . when the European war is ended it (the Soviet Union) will have no reason to help us destroy Japan, occupy it with Japanese troops, and make it an American colony. It does not want powerful America to supplant Japan in the Far East."

(2) "The only hope for peace lies in popular government, devoting itself to the struggle against poverty and famine and economic and social injustice, instead of conspiracy and intrigue and war against one's neighbors" and "the survival of democracy . . . will depend upon our understanding, our sympathy with Asiatic peoples struggling for freedom, and our turning at last to a democratic policy for the peoples of China and of all Asia." *America's Role in Asia* is a "must" book.

THEODORE DEMAREST WALSER

## Ways of Peace

*Introduction to Non-violence.* By Theodore Paullin. Pacifist Research Bureau. 1944. 58 pages. 25c.

This, the first of a new series on "Non-violent Action in Tension Areas," is a critical study of the various types of non-violence ranging all the way from "Violence without Hate" (Chap. II) to "Active Goodwill and Reconciliation" (Chap. VII), analyzing their effectiveness as means by which groups may accomplish social change, and illustrating each with historical situations in the United States and Europe. The author does not attempt to weigh the relative ethical or philosophical values of the various methods, but he greatly clarifies a field in which there has been far too much muddy thinking.

He gives in small space and in readable style a clear picture of the forces of non-violence. Valuable alike to the uninitiated and the expert.

J. E. F.

## Labor Saga

*Tailor's Progress.* The Story of a Famous Union and the Men Who Made it. By Benjamin Stolberg. Doubleday Doran. 360 pages. $2.75.

This book is much more than a history of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, perhaps the cleanest and most effective in the United States. This union is studied in the setting of the entire labor movement, modern technological development and the history of American democracy from 1880-1944. It is in my opinion an unrivalled introduction to such matters as CIO-AFL, Communist penetration in unions, the New Deal, labor parties in the United States, and the character and role of such figures as Gompers, Green, Lewis, Hillman, Dubinsky and scores of others. Hundreds of FOR members, COs in CPS and prison, and others should regard it as a "must" item. And they can be assured that Stolberg's humor and wit will make it a pleasant dose of reading.

A. J. MUSTE

# Pro and Con

## World Government

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

The July issue of FELLOWSHIP contained articles by Vernon Nash and Theodore Paullin that were very helpful. I would like to comment on one aspect of pacifist endeavor in these days as stimulated by some of Paullin's ideas. It seems to me most important that the FOR and all pacifist groups should unceasingly stress the importance of genuine world government, the first of the eight points of the National Conference's (September 1941) "Eight Ways to Build Peace."

Mr. Paullin puts us all in his debt in his article and Pacifist Research Bureau publications for his stress on and clear unfolding of the slow, intangible forces making for unity which make genuine government possible. Yet few if any pacifists object to the use of force by government under law against criminal individuals or groups; few fail to see its positive as well as negative values. It is being most realistic and true to ourselves, therefore, in order to persuade more of our fellow men to our position, that we do not at any time neglect any one of the FOR's eight points. To neglect genuine world government in our message today is to contribute to ignorance of genuine world government and to the likelihood that balance of power proposals will secure more of the attention of the people, and it is to make the pacifist proposals seem ridiculously utopian to the great majority of people who feel the need of force in various measures. We always run the chances of being misunderstood but that surely is no reason for failing to speak out.

We do not need to stand for detailed forms of world government. But we can include now in our message to the world such things as these: functional consultative agencies, a universal league without sanctions, and along with Carl Hambro, President of the League of Nations Assembly, an international court will deal directly with individuals who threaten peace. Instead of confusing ourselves, and leaving others to the vociferous suggestions of those who believe in the balance of power, with ill-founded feelings about "this is not the time," let us constantly and with high faith point out the need for such government.

ELLERY B. HASKELL.

## NSBRO

A. J. MUSTE, NEVIN SAYRE, and
the FOR National Council:

From its beginning the Fellowship of Reconciliation has opposed conscription for war. But in 1940, as the Selective Service Act was being passed, we and the Historic Peace Churches undertook at the eleventh hour to provide some alternative short of induction into the armed forces, or incarceration, for those persons who could not conscientiously accept military service.

In time it became increasingly clear that in reality our very good intention to establish a socially significant alternative not only had compromised our basic and traditional position, but even had resulted in facilitating military control over the people of our country.

For two and one half years we have debated the advisability of withdrawal from this dubious association. Meantime, as the result of earnest consideration and discussion, the democratic processes have been at work. There has been an ever-growing trend in our membership toward separation from the National Service Board for Religious Objectors.

Nonetheless, there are those who have resigned from our Fellowship because they feel that as an organization we are moribund. They consider our failure to have withdrawn from the National Service Board to be highly symptomatic.

We who have signed this letter do not altogether share this view. We are, however, struck with these anamolies: (1) FOR cooperates with the Selective Service Act while some of us are held prisoners for refusing to cooperate with it. (2) Others of us repeatedly have indicated that, although accepting the idea of useful work under the Act, we are convinced that FOR should not in any way assist in the Act's administration.

These situations do not lead us to withdraw. They lead us first to a re-evaluation of our total purpose, approach and program. They lead us, secondly, to urge the membership and the National Council to prayerful consideration of the dangers of our present position.

We hope that the National Council will make a final break with Selective Service at its December meeting. The future of FOR is involved in our decision. Clearly it is necessary that we give a revolutionary witness against conscription.

Observation of the Selective Service violators here—pacifist and non-pacifist, avowed war objectors and so-called technical violators—reveals boldly the vast displacement, frustration and bitterness that the Selective Service Act has already brought about in the lives of our countrymen. Its effect abroad is another and even more tragic story.

We believe that men more and more will reject the forces which have conscripted them; they will turn to those who have held out most intransigently against regimentation.

We hope you will so act as to make FOR that light for which these men will search.

Sincerely,

Robert Swann
William Hefner
Richard Strachan
James F. McDaniel
D. Thornton Conrow
Gordon S. Goehring
Alex Stach
Preston Luitweiler
Bayard Rustin
Charles Butcher
Stephen Safran
Francis B. Hall
Larry Gara
Ralph M. Galt
Robert M. Currier
Victor D. Schumacher
William L. Richards

# A PAGE OF COMMENT BY READERS

**Readers are invited to contribute to this page. Please keep letters brief, since space is severely limited.**

## Jim Crow

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

In response to my narrative in the August issue of FELLOWSHIP entitled "Tackling Jim Crow is a Dangerous Job," a number of letters have come to me.

Some of the letters assumed that the unexpected could never happen when one dealt with the race problem carefully, and that challenging racism could always be done successfully by using only educational techniques. My experience has convinced me that rarely does one know what will happen on an action project before the project takes place. Groups in Denver and in Syracuse (to cite only two examples) have successfully cleaned up discrimination in rinks in their respective city without threat of mob action. And yet, their strategy, to begin with, did not differ greatly from that of our Cleveland group.

But further, even the fact that one knows violence might take place does not mean ipso facto that he will retreat from the struggle. How is it possible to deal with a problem as explosive as the race problem, and yet avoid any real struggle? The nonviolent way is emphatically not one of avoiding a struggle. Rather, it is a way which ultimately claims that the power of absorbing physical punishment in the spirit of good will and without fear may have a redemptive effect upon those who inflict the punishment.

This does not mean that a group should look for problem areas in which violence may arise. It simply means one will not run away from a problem only because violence is a possibility. It is admitted that our strategy may have been all wrong in Cleveland. But it would have been impossible to assess this before our group tried its plan. Just a few weeks ago eight of us interracially visited a Cleveland swimming pool where the white swimmers were known to eject Negroes forcibly when they entered the grounds. This might have happened to us. But it didn't! Instead we had a very creative evening, ending in a discussion of the race problem with a large group of perhaps a hundred young people around the pool. Could anyone have prophesied this?

It was impossible to know the effect of our skating rink experience on the young fellows who formed the mob. I know that the rink owner respected us greatly for standing up under pressure, for he later said as much to an NAACP lawyer who talked with him about the rink policy. I suspect that many of the fellows in the mob did a little more thinking on the race problem than they had done previously.

Roller rinks are certainly not the most important places in society to deal with. But there is no single institution of our society so important to deal with that all other institutions should be forgotten. The struggle must go on at many points simultaneously.

GEORGE M. HOUSER

**FOR Field Secretaries**

*South:* Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville 4, Tenn.; *Midwest:* Emerson Schwenk, 740 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Ill.; *Northwest:* Mary Farquharson, 4033 University Way, Seattle, Wash.; *Northern California:* Caleb Foote, 2151 Vine Street, Berkeley 7, Cal.; *Southwest:* Glenn Smiley, 1837 N. Berendo Street, Los Angeles 27, Cal.; *Rocky Mountain:* Margaret Rohrer, 1418 Grape Street, Denver, Colo.; *Rural:* Warren Nelson, Prairie du Sac, Wis.; *Action Projects:* George Houser, 7100 Kinsman Rd., Cleveland Ohio.

# PEACE will not just happen!

It depends on intelligent effort. We must know what's wrong with the world and what's needed to make it right. And then we have to educate others and enlist them in the task. Read these books and then get others to read them.

## *Peace Is the Victory*

A symposium by 13 prominent Christian pacifists—Fosdick, E. Stanley Jones, Holmes, Muste, Albert W. Palmer, Villard, Kirby Page, Devere Allen, Harrop Freeman, Hiram Motherwell, Theodore Paullin, Clarence Pickett, Robert Stevens.

Working from the premise that sacrificial good will can and will create a brotherhood of all human-kind, these writers discuss basic principles, problems, and trends; planning for peace, demobilization, and reconstruction; the necessity of free international organization and of adjustments in international law and economic relationships; and post-war plans for Europe, Asia, and the Americas.

Harrop Freeman, Editor **$1.50** Harper & Bros., Publisher

---

## *War, Transition, and Peace*

The best brief discussion of world problems. Three chapters: The Background of the War, The Essentials of Peace, and World Organization. Prepared by cooperative efforts of five of the principal peace groups, including the FOR.

Order Several at only **15¢** Give them to others

---

## *Forerunners Studybooks*

Nothing better for use in personal study or group discussion of world affairs. Concise, pocket-size, illustrated, equipped with questions to stimulate discussion and suggestions for using the material in meetings. Highly recommended by ministers, youth workers, educational directors, and teachers.

**Pattern for Peacemakers,** *by R. Alfred Hassler*

**New Wars for Old,** *by Frank Olmstead*

**Exit Empire,** *by Vernon Nash*

**The Next Peace,** *by R. Alfred Hassler*

Order one of each at **25¢** Also in adult edition

## Help Stop CONSCRIPTION

FOR headquarters have available exactly what is needed to arouse public concern about conscription. Order as many copies of this material as you can and distribute it widely.

***What's Wrong with Peacetime Universal Military Training for the United States?***

A single-sheet flyer with five strong arguments.

50 for 25¢—250 for $1.00

•

***Should the U. S. Adopt Permanent Military Conscription?***

Statements of 12 religious, educational, and civic groups.

15¢ a dozen—100 for $1.00

•

***Peacetime Conscription***

Brief but comprehensive answers to the most common questions.

35¢ a dozen—50 for $1.00

•

## CHRISTMAS CARDS

This year we offer again a Christmas card to be sold for the benefit of the War Victims Fund of the FOR. Printed in two colors, it is not elaborate, but simple and dignified.

***A Unique Message***

The message is one written by Henri Roser, former French secretary of the FOR, on Christmas, 1942, in Nazi-occupied Paris. It is especially appropriate for this purpose.

Plain-back Single Cards
WITHOUT ENVELOPES
to send as postcards
50¢ doz.—$4.00 per hundred

WITH ENVELOPES
for personal note on back
65¢ doz.—$5.00 per hundred

**Order them NOW!**

---

**Literature Department**

**FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.**